UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Greatest Need of the Post-War World:
Moral Character - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Racial Democracy in the Ethical Societies
- - - - - - *W. Edwin Collier*

Camp Smokemont - *Bernard George Weinberg*

Jesus and Religion - - - - -
- - - *F. H. Amphlett Micklewright*

Voices of Latin America - *John H. Hershey*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXX NUMBER 2

Chicago, April, 1944

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

W. Edwin Collier: Leader of the Philadelphia Ethical Society.

C. A. Hawley: Minister of First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

John H. Hershey: Minister of First Congregational Society in West Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright: Minister of Cross St. Chapel, Manchester, England.

Bernard George Weinberg: Conscientious objector now in a Civilian Public Service Camp in North Carolina.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 19
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 22

ARTICLES—
The Greatest Need of the Post-War World: Moral Character—LEO HIRSCH 22
Racial Democracy in the Ethical Societies—W. EDWIN COLLIER .. 26
Camp Smokemont—BERNARD GEORGE WEINBERG 27
Jesus and Religion—F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT 28
Voices of Latin America—V—Gilberto Freyre: Brazilian Sociologist—JOHN H. HERSHEY 29

POETRY—
A Poet's Peace:
First Prize—FLORENCE THIOT MILNER 25
Second Prize—GERTRUDE LYON SYLVESTER 25
Third Prize—WESTON MCDANIEL 25

THE STUDY TABLE—
Simple Human Drama—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 30
From the Holy Roman Empire to Masaryk—C. A. HAWLEY 31

CORRESPONDENCE—
Many Mansions—FRIEDRICH BRUNS 31
Reply to Doctor Holmes—JAMES W. MCKNIGHT 31
Political Prisoners in India—TARAKNATH DAS 32
Danger of Distraction—MRS. SIDNEY A. SHERMAN 32

THE FIELD—
Test Case—*The Open Forum* 18

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Test Case of Jehovah's Witnesses

The Southern California Executive Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union last Monday voted cooperation in a test case involving the right of Jehovah's Witnesses to distribute religious literature to hotel tenants, without first securing the permission of the hotel manager. The case is that of People of the State of California v. Grace Vaughan and Leon F. Scheerer.

Does one of Jehovah's Witnesses have the constitutional right to approach tenants of a hotel, without permission of the hotel manager, to offer religious literature? This novel and important issue of religious freedom is being presented to the Appellate Department of the Los Angeles Superior Court in the current appeal of Grace Vaughan and Leon F. Scheerer, Jehovah's Witnesses, convicted last week by an all-woman jury in the Los Angeles Municipal Court of "malicious disturbance of the peace." Upon the complaint of H. W. Aiken in behalf of the manager of the Daily Hotel, Mrs. Vaughan and Mr. Scheerer were charged with disturbing the peace of both Mr. Aiken and the tenants of the hotel, because of the persistence of these Jehovah's Witnesses in seeking to contact tenants of the hotel over the opposition of the hotel management.

Judge Arthur S. Guerin, presiding over the trial, refused to instruct the jury that the management of the hotel had no authority to evict Jehovah's Witnesses seeking thus directly to approach hotel tenants. Objections made by attorney A. L. Wirin, representing the defendants, that the prosecution abridged freedom of religion and freedom of the press were also overruled by Judge Guerin.

In the course of his instructions to the jury, Judge Guerin, however, adopted in many instances the liberal views expressed in recent opinions of the United States Supreme Court.

Judge Guerin, in sentencing the defendants last Friday, welcomed the case as a test of the law. For sentence he imposed the nominal fine of $10.00 on each defendant; and allowed the defendants to remain free pending the appeal without any bond.

—The Open Forum, March 4, 1944.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXX APRIL, 1944 No. 2

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

The Lenten season, now mounting to its climax of Good Friday and Easter, seems peculiarly and solemnly appropriate this year. When if ever did men have such occasion for confessing sin and doing penance for sin? The burden of guilt in this war now lies upon us all, for the time has passed when we can serenely assess responsibility upon the enemy and regard ourselves as innocents. The present horror is like a tapestry woven upon a loom, with threads from all the nations—threads red with blood!—intertwining into a single ghastly texture. Britain as well as Germany, America as well as Japan, must stand convicted of its own deeds, and these deeds are dreadful. War is what it is, a thing of utter horror, and those who consent to it must fight it out on all its lowest levels of indecency. This is the only way, as we are told, to win the victory. It is the sure way, as we should know, to lose the peace, and therewith prepare the way, as precisely as a street is paved, for the coming of another war. Somehow, somewhere, sometime, there must come a break in this endless chain of wars, if man is to survive at all. And how can this break come if not through repentance of sin, and high resolve to seek the better way? And who can enter upon this experience of repentance and resolve more consistently and indeed naturally than Christians, religionists, who are supposed to know something about the spirit and its laws? What are we here for, we believers in God, if not to bear witness to his Kingdom? If we are merely conformed to this world and its wicked ways, and not transformed by the renewing of our minds to what is "the good and acceptable will of God," what do we more than others? Why have a religion, or profess the practice of religion? It is the unescapable pertinency of these questions, I imagine, which makes the observance of Lent so inevitable a part of the church year. We must confess the sin of which all men are guilty together; and then, by God's help of our own determination, we must strive to put by this sin, and to enter upon the single way of life. Again the drama of Christ is being enacted upon the earth. For the sins of humanity we are being slain, crucified. Deep, deep down into hell we are descending. Shall we be raised into heaven—a new heaven and a new earth, of which the vision has so long been seen? As we are liberals, we do not believe that this may come by any miracle wrought in the predestined will of God. Rather do we believe that this drama of repentance and redemption must be our own work. We must save ourselves! So Lent comes with its challenge, in such hours of agony as man has never known before. To chasten our own sins, to forgive the sins of others, to dedicate ourselves to God's Kingdom and its perfect law of love —this is our holy task this day.

II

That was a brave and splendid thing which was done the other day by the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo Lang, when he stood up in the House of Lords and condemned the saturation bombing of German cities. One would have thought that this noble utterance would have stirred the Christian conscience of the world to speech which would have shaken governments everywhere. It did stir a noble group of fifteen American and Canadian clergymen to join Lang in protest, and a later group of twenty-eight to protest on their own. But the rest was silence! Indeed, there were some clergymen who actually endorsed this horror and therewith gave it blessing. It is probable that posterity will look back upon this age as marking the lowest descent of mankind into utter savagery—lower even than the Dark Ages!—and the final evidence of this descent will be the ruthless bombing of civilian populations. Germany began it—but what of it, if we straightway take over her standards of warfare and "better the instruction"? As things are now, it is the United Nations, the champions of culture and civilization, who are blotting out whole cities, and blasting and roasting alive in their streets, homes, and bomb shelters, unnumbered thousands of men, women, and children. Little children, babes in arms, pregnant women, boys and girls, invalids and aged, these are now being wantonly destroyed on a scale of slaughter hitherto unimaginable and amid circumstances of agony indescribable. And no argument for it except the sheer assertion that it is shortening the war and saving the lives of our boys in service! But where is the proof that it is not lengthening the war rather than shortening it, by steeling our

enemy to a last and utterly desperate resistance where there is no hope, and thus increasing the sacrifice of our soldiery? Ruthless methods, precisely based on Hitler terrorism, never hasten peace, but only achieve extermination. And granted this witless argument is true, as the Nazis would have it true in their crimes of violence, then why do we not go straight to the logical conclusion, and use germs and poison gas against the enemy? If the war goes on long enough, I suppose we will—and then justify our fiendishness as we are now justifying our smashing of great populaces, by plea of military necessity. It all goes to show what war does to us. In the beginning we have standards, scruples, even ideals. Then, as the bloodshed goes on, we begin step by step to slip into Avernus, and at last are using gladly and eagerly the devil's weapons. There is no such thing as a civilized war, or a good war, or a holy war. There is only *war*. And war is HELL.

III

The warmongering of this hour, which takes the particularly obnoxious form of discouraging all peace talk, or rumors of peace, or even work for peace, is a thing to prompt despair. Is war so desirable that we would delay its ending, or peace so undesirable that we would delay its coming, by so much as a split second of time? How refreshing, in contrast to all this talk of war to the death, or at least to "unconditional surrender" of our enemies was a recent statement in the Sun Dial column of the *New York Sun* by that accomplished writer, Mr. H. I. Phillips. I set it down here in full as follows:

> To hear some people talk you would think Sherman had said "Peace is hell!"
>
> The thought of going back to a quiet, orderly world of brotherly love throws them into depths of pessimism. Of course, the men and women who are doing the fighting don't feel that way; it's the folks far behind the lines with none of their loved ones at the front.
>
> The less danger they're in the more they're nervous about waking up some morning and finding peace staring them in the face. . .
>
> It's just too bad. Maybe Washington should begin now to do something to build up peace morale; to condition people for struggling on through peacetimes. Maybe there should be an office of OPI (Office of Peace Information) created immediately to keep the fidgety folks fully informed of the dangers ahead.
>
> The Government could even create some medals for Distinguished Conduct in the Face of Peace.
>
> With special ribbons for the fellow with nerve enough to hear a peace rumor and say, "Fine. It can't come too soon to suit me. I'll take it over war any old time."

Mr. Phillips is a gallant gentleman—it takes courage to speak out in this fashion on behalf of peace. But his courage becomes a bit extravagant in the hope that "Washington should begin now to do something to build up peace morale." *Washington?* build up *peace morale?!* Never in all our history was there an administration so war-minded as the present one. In the War of 1812, Madison had no heart for the conflict, and would gladly have ended it at any time. In the Civil War, Lincoln always had his hands extended to the South in pity and pleading for peace, and grew worn and tragic of countenance that his efforts for peace were vain. In the last war, President Wilson conducted a perpetual peace drive which he regarded as of no less importance than the war drive on the western front. But in this war, who in Washington has cared a fig for peace, or spoken a single word to hasten its coming? The administration seems to be fairly obsessed with the idea that there is something dangerous to the war effort in the effort after peace—that the two things are in some strange way antithetical. Can the administration never understand that the olive branch is the stoutest weapon for victory, real victory, that we have? Does it wholly fail to remember that it was Woodrow Wilson's peace effort in 1918 that broke down the German will to resist, and ended the war with the German armies still unbeaten? A definite, enlightened, and generous peace offer today might end this war tomorrow. Why should the chance be lost?

IV

Atrocity stories continue. It is certain now that they will be exploited in this war, as in the last war, as long as the fighting continues. Nothing like horror and hate to overcome disillusionment and despair! But this means, for civilized folk, that stories of another kind must be continued. Let us match evil with good, cruelty with kindness, and at least hold the balances even. Thus, I would set down here the heartening account of the American flyers lost in the snowy wastes of the Alps. One hundred and fourteen of them shot down, and parachuted onto the icy slopes of the mountains! The German DNB News Agency reported the plight of these men on February 28th last, and announced that the government was organizing and sending out trained rescue parties. The next day came the news that ten of the lost aviators had been found, all suffering from frostbite and "hardly able to move." The search for the other lost Americans was being continued, though they seemed to be "doomed to death in the snow and cold because storms were making it impossible for Alpine guides to rescue them." This story mitigates nothing of the horror of Nazi misrule, but it does go far to correct the atrocity side of military operations. Another story sheds a glaring light on the use of atrocity reports to help in the sale of bonds. At the very crisis of the Fourth War Loan Drive there was published an announcement that the Nazis had deliberately bombed Red Cross field hospitals on the Italian front. Several days later, on February 11th, to be exact, the Associated Press correspondent sent a dispatch from the Anzio beachhead, which read: "Investigation has established that the bombing of the Red Cross field hospital on February 7th and the shelling of another on February 10th, in which thirty persons were killed, *were not deliberate.*" This dispatch, as I have said, was filed on February 11th. But it was not published in this country until February 16th—the day after the Fourth War Loan Drive came to an end. It is to be noted that these non-atrocity tales, if I may call them

such, are published by the newspapers, though by no means as conspicuously and sensationally as the alleged atrocities. The newspapers, in other words, print what is available. It is the government manipulation of this material that is so regrettable. The playing up of horrors—the timing of them at crucial moments of public excitement—the calculated use of them to incite hatred and revenge! At bottom, of course, it is all a part of war, and will never be corrected till war itself is done away with. Yet does every instinct of truth, every humane sentiment, and every Christian principle within me revolt against this thing.

V

The late war between the President and the Congress, fought at a time of war against our enemies abroad, was a tragedy of the first order. Large responsibility for this tragedy belongs to the Congress for its ever having surrendered to the President the powers of governmental prerogative duly delegated to it by the Constitution. In the early days of the Roosevelt rule, when everybody was frightened by the depression, the Congress was only too glad to yield to the President all functions of legislation as well as administration. Blanket appropriations were passed, giving the President huge sums of money to play with as he pleased. Sweeping grants of power were made with scarcely a dissenting vote, authorizing the President to establish commissions, bureaus, executive agencies, responsible to him alone as a kind of American dictator. Congress all but abdicated its place in government. Those were the days when laws were written in the White House, and condescendingly sent on to the Capitol for enactment. Those were the days when the President kindly specified the legislation that "must" be passed, like a teacher specifying to his pupils the lessons that must learned, or a master to his servants the things that must be done. What wonder that the Executive became vain and arrogant with the uses of power, and at last reached such a stage of elevation that he was able to send to the Congress such a message as that in veto of the tax bill! It was inevitable, of course, if our American state was not to be transformed into a Fascist state, such as John T. Flynn forecasts in his new book, *As We Go Marching,* that the Congress should recover from its collapse and take over once again its independent powers under the Constitution. This, happily, it is now doing. This country is a representative democracy once again! The Congress may not be as wise as we might like. Its tendencies are lamentably reactionary rather than progressive. The combination in its ranks of Bourbon Democrats from the South and Bourbon Republicans from the North is sinister. But the worst of Congress is better than the best of one-man rule. "This country with its institutions," said Lincoln, "belongs to the people." The people have a right to be heard in the halls of Congress as well as in the offices of the White House. They have been heard there lately in a way to restore one's faith in the working of the American system of government. The resultant strife between the two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue is tragic. But it is the price that must be paid for past mistakes.

VI

I have gotten all through reading the so-called war news in the newspapers. It is not that this news is too horrible, but that it is so definitely untrue to the facts! I feel about it as does Robert Sherrod in his recent book entitled *Tarawa: The Story of a Battle.* He says that he does not like the way the home newspapers play the war, and quotes the remark of a fighting sergeant, "The war that is being written in the newspapers must be a different war from the one we see." Different, indeed! Every day in the newspapers come the triumphant stories of victories on every front. The losses of the enemy are terrific—there have been more Nazi soldiers killed and captured on the Russian front than there are soldiers enrolled in all the armies of the Reich! On the other hand, our losses (in the newspapers) are so trivial as to make the actual casualty lists absolutely unaccountable. On the basis of the stories published in the press, this war should have been over a long time ago. Yet as a matter of fact it is dragging on, and not getting anywhere in particular. Therefore I am not reading the war news any longer, for I have learned that these daily accounts of conflict give an utterly false perspective of the fighting. The trouble, of course, is not with the press. The correspondents at the front know what is going on. We discover this when they come to write their books a year or two years after the events they describe. There are no easy victories recorded in these books. Take any one of them, and as you read, go back to the contemporary newspaper accounts of these same happenings the author is now belatedly telling you about, and see if you can find any resemblance between the two. The fact is, the cover is off by the time these books are written. "Now it can be told!" But in the daily paper, the censor is at work on the one side to suppress the truth, and the propaganda bureaus are at work on the other side to manufacture deceptions. In other words, the newspapers publish what is prepared for them—and this so-called news is the greatest mess of "pap" that was ever passed out to a supposedly intelligent public. When you come to think of it, what impudence can compare with that of the government official who decides what a free people shall or shall not know, or be allowed to think, about their own war? And what shall we say as to the gross injustice done the service men who are fighting a desperate enemy under unimaginable conditions of danger and death, and are all the while depicted to the home folks as on some kind of a pleasant picnic? This thing is abominable. And until it is corrected, I am not reading any war news.

Jottings

It would be interesting to know what Hitler and Mussolini talk about. Is it the dreams of yesterday, or the nightmares of tomorrow?

New words added to our vocabulary by the Nazis—*swastika, fuehrer, gauleiter, gestapo, blitz, weltmacht.* What ugly words they are—a sure reflection of the ugliness of the Nazi movement itself!

In a parliamentary form of government, Mr. Roosevelt would have been out of office long since. But under our system there comes none the less the day of reckoning. Why should any true believer in democracy lament that there is to be an election day this fall?

We are told that Roosevelt must run for a fourth term because there is no other Democrat who can win. Exactly! That is what always happens in a long one-man regime. All other leaders disappear for sheer lack of opportunity. Had Roosevelt retired in 1941, there would have been no dearth of Democratic leaders today.

With Russia blasting Finland out of the war, and Britain blockading Eire, the little countries seem to be getting it about as hard from one side of this war as from the other. The slogan on both sides seems to be—toe the mark, or else—!

There was a certain Roman general, according to Tacitus, who "made a desert and called it peace." This general would certainly feel at home in the world today!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Greatest Need of the Post-War World: Moral Character

LEO HIRSCH

Before this global war, we had a long depression that remained with us far longer than anyone had thought possible. It wore us down, not only economically and financially but in spirit as well. We were eagerly hoping to see the turning of the tide and the return of prosperity. Many prophets assured us that the crisis of 1929 could not last more than a few months. Their confident predictions remind us of the recent cry: "Peace by Christmas." The war is dragging out to five years and the end is not yet. The greatest losses and suffering are yet to come.

In our great expectancy to see some change for the better, in our eager yearning for peace, it might be well to ask ourselves: Are we prepared in proper thought and spirit for the change, if it should come, or, on the other hand, if it is postponed, are we able to command sufficient intelligence and courage to learn the wisdom of adapting ourselves to a radically different and new order of social organization? Are we prepared to meet the future, whatever may be its nature?

Another question to ask is: Do we Americans clearly understand what liberal democracy is and in just what respects it differs from other current social and political philosophies?

Nazism and Fascism have a perfect hatred and contempt for democracy because they have reduced the conception of man to a mere product of economic or biological forces. The democratic conception of man is that he is a personality, a soul capable of reason, capable of developing himself in the light of the ethical ideal. And because, in a democracy, the individual is the center and pivot of our social order, we proclaim that the ultimate goal of democracy is neither power nor security but freedom with a certain basic security: freedom under which each and every individual will have an equal opportunity to develop his highest and finest nature.

It is because democracy looks upon personality as sacred and inviolable and worthwhile that we have incorporated our civil liberties in our Bill of Rights. Out of this democratic concept have come such great achievements as science, art, poetry, Humanism, civilization, and out of it alone can come the liberation of races and of submerged classes.

However, there are vast numbers of persons in our own country and throughout the world who believe that the world after the war will be the same, as to life and conditions, that prevailed during the pre-war period, so that our international industrialists and financiers are already eagerly looking forward to what they call "normalcy." They are already planning to allocate economic power to different influential groups through their super-cartels. If we can win no better result than such imperialistic ends from this horrible war and its frightful human mutilations, then it surely will be the greatest tragedy that has ever befallen a suffering humanity. We shall have failed to learn that the primary business of men and women on this earth is not the creation of great wealth, or the securing of power, or the building of the longest bridges, or the largest cities or the most powerful armies and navies and air forces but the creation of fine human beings, better than any previous type, to end squalor and bestiality and to bring all the good to the many—that the aim of democracy is to change not only the conditions under which men live but human nature itself.

The reason why we still hold to this Hollywood-Wall Street philosophy, that is concerned mainly with materialistic inconsequentials, is that there are three fallacies still prevalent and dominant in our present-day thinking. They represent very different points of view, but apparently all spring from the same source, namely, the idea that the stage setting for the return of peace and prosperity is determined by forces quite apart from

our human behavior and conduct and that man's depraved nature is incapable of achieving peace and righteousness on this earth. One of these fallacies I would designate the "depravity of human nature" theory. The second is the fallacy of the "manifest destiny" theory of our country's history and of the future that lies before us. The third is the fallacy of "economic determinism."

John Calvin was the theologian of the first doctrine and developed the theory of man's utter depravity and man's inability to transcend the evil that exists within him. He repudiated man's faith in human nature. And now again we are summoned to return to this Calvinistic superstition. Nietzsche was the philosopher of this same theory. He had only contempt for the common man with his animal desires and passions, and created the theory of the superman and thus laid the foundation for the present Fuehrer pattern. He believed that spiritual mastery was impossible for common men. Then came the intellectual German, Oswald Spengler, who in his famous book, *The Decline of the West,* launched his theory of doom. He emphasized his belief that each civilization passes into oblivion and darkness out of which it emerges, just like a star. We are in the grip of evolution and devolution. Death and evil are the final victors. There is nothing we can do to save ourselves or the world. In our time, this belief seems to many to have been substantiated by the tyranny, cruelty, and aggression of the totalitarian states and their leaders.

The prophets of doom, in my judgment, are wrong, no matter what the catastrophes and disasters of our world may be. Civilization may pass into darkness and death but the historic process never ceases. The moral forces in the universe and in the lives of men will go on and endeavor to achieve the realization of the supreme goal—no matter what the difficulties. To the philosophic historian, there seems to be no reason for discouragement as long as in the rise and fall of civilization each culture, as it slides down into the valley of extinction, passes on to the people that succeed it the best elements in the way of ethics, learning, and the arts which have been achieved. To him there exists a cultural continuity wherein human knowledge and goodness are conserved, increased, improved, and passed on, so that each civilization constitutes a wave bearing upon its crest a burden of treasure to be passed on to subsequent races and ages. There is no doom for man as long as the human race can bring forth such superlative leaders as Moses, the Hebrew prophets, Jesus, Buddha, Mohammed, Jefferson, Lincoln, Schweitzer, Gandhi, Niemoeller, Kagawa. These are the personalities that enable us to have a prevision of what the spiritual possibilities of man really are and what he may yet be.

The phrase "manifest destiny" has played an important role in the oratory and literature of those individuals whose sober thoughts give place to a form of emotional optimism. They insist that continued progress in our national life, despite any temporary depression, must certainly characterize the future of the people whose past reveals abundant evidence of a manifest destiny silently and mysteriously directing every critical period of our national life.

What is the basis of this idea of "must," the idea of a power working hidden and mysterious, quite irrespective of our initiative and endeavor? I am willing to admit, as I certainly believe, that there is a divinity that shapes our ends, whether from the standpoint of the individual or of the collective group. But all history teaches that whatever divine power there may be in our individual lives or the life of the nation, *it works through human instruments.* We are not merely the passive observers of a stupendous national drama. Whatever may be its character, we are certainly actors and participants in the midst of its development. Our national destiny is certainly not independent of our resourcefulness or of our national character. As we look back over the history of our nation, it is evident that our progress has been due to the fact that there were men and women in every generation who believed in something and someone higher than themselves. Not only were they courageous in expressing their convictions, but their lives measured up to their faith, their spirit of endurance, and their determination.

It is easy to believe in the manifest destiny of a nation as long as there is a recognition of a moral and spiritual fibre in the spirit of its people. The idea of manifest destiny is too vague and superstitious unless it is based upon our confidence in the character of the people who can make such a destiny possible. I do not believe that any divine miracle has happened or will happen in our national history, but I do believe that a divine power does manifest itself through the channels of consecrated human personality and that the achievement of the democratic way of life will mainly depend on the extent to which the common man is willing to do his part in order that all of us may have a better world.

If we could convince one generation of Americans of the basic ethical principle underlying our democracy (the intrinsic worth of every individual), and get it to work for peace and righteousness, the human race could then prove itself worthy of being started and we would thus vindicate our belief in our manifest destiny. We must never make any marked distinction between our nation and the other nations. We must not permit ourselves to make the same mistake that the Israelites made when they declared themselves the "chosen people." For we can observe today that Nazi Germany and Shinto Japan are suffering from the same manifestations. All the nations together should feel their joint manifest destiny to create a *corpus spirituale* based on differing human elements with divers paths to justice and righteousness. Humanity in its social orientations must realize that the earth is round. We must begin to think in spherical terms in our international relations, not only geographically but socially and spiritually. We must learn that we live on a spherical earth rather than a flat earth, in the sense that the consequences of what we do eventually return to us.

Recent events and trends in the dealing of the United States with occupied countries in Europe are not only very disturbing but raise a momentous question. Is America giving up its real manifest destiny in being a beacon light of freedom to all men, is America to be a dependable influence for genuine freedom in Europe, or is our great military power to be thrown behind reactionary and Fascist forces? The eyes of the entire world are upon us. Are we going to support the movement for a free Italy in the glorious tradition of Garibaldi and Mazzini, or are we going to encourage in the name of military expediency and order the old Fascist rulers? The United Nations have a great opportunity for lifting the world out of conditions and ways of life that lead to war. Let us rise to that responsibility and duty.

Finally, there is the third fallacy which I have called "economic determinism." There is a general tendency today to explain through economic causes almost anything which happens. Economic law is supreme. In this fallacy that economic knowledge is the universal solvent, there is a pessimistic attitude quite in contrast to the optimistic point of view of the manifest destiny school of thought.

I do not wish to minimize in any sense, certainly not to disparage, the importance of economic causes which brought about the ten-year depression as well as this global war, or which may in turn lead us out again into peace and welfare. But here again we must recognize the fact that these forces, however powerful they may be, and however far reaching in their operation, nevertheless cannot be regarded as independent of the activities of the human being. They indeed affect us but we in turn react upon them. We may modify them at certain times, and under special circumstances we may wholly neutralize them.

The relation of man to the economic forces of the world is analogous to the relation of man to the physical forces. In neither sphere can we change the workings of natural law, but through the knowledge of natural law we may direct these forces toward our desired ends. Man is not the plaything either of the forces of nature or of determining economic conditions. That which characterizes man as different from all other animals and places him in a class wholly by himself is the fact that, while all the animal kingdom develops in the process of evolution according to its power of adaptation to environment, man develops and progresses through his ability to adapt his environment to himself. It is the outstanding distinction of the human species that it can command circumstances to obey its wish and will.

During the past three decades, we have passed through two periods of prosperity and depression and two World Wars. We must have learned something of permanent value from these experiences. We realize certainly more clearly today the mistakes which must have counted against us throughout the period of peace and prosperity, and it is possible that this terrible global war may impart to us a new wisdom to meet peace again when it comes to us. The pressure of these past experiences ought to bring home to us the self-evident truth that full employment is the key to peace and prosperity in the coming reconstruction period. Also that technology and the bounty of natural resources must be harnessed in the service of the common welfare. Also that in all these economic problems intelligent planning for the post-war period is absolutely imperative. It will be no simple matter to transform all of our implements of war into ploughshares. Insuperable though the war effort was considered to be, the work ahead for the peace will call for even a more titanic effort. Both government and industry must collaborate and cooperate in this supreme task.

We are in danger at the present not merely of losing our wealth and material comforts and necessities of life but also our spirit. Whatever the future may hold for us, we cannot face it with any degree of satisfaction if we have lost control of ourselves, if we have come to distrust our own powers of character to overcome present and future difficulties. We dare not allow a deflation of spirit. To use a phrase of William James, we must call upon the untapped sources of our power. There must be the will to endure, the determination not to be defeated, whatever may happen.

There is another lesson which I believe our experience should teach us and which must exercise a profound effect upon our whole outlook into the future. We need a renaissance of idealism. Many people have a false impression of the significance of idealism. They think of it as a philosophy separated far from the practical everyday life of affairs. They would go further perhaps and insist that the man who has an idealistic philosophy of life unfits himself to live satisfactorily and practically in the world as it is. Now, for me, idealism means that there are values which cannot be expressed in material terms. In times of peace and prosperity, values are likely to be expressed solely in material terms. In the years of plenty we lose sight of the fact that there are other values so far beyond the sphere of getting and expending as to be easily overlooked, and, if hastily recognized, at once forgotten.

When we come into the quiet and sober moments of these years of travail and suffering to ask ourselves what are, after all, the highest and truest values, highest and truest in the sense that they can never be sacrificed for any other, we come to the calm judgment that there do exist values of this high order which reveal to us sources of supreme ethical satisfaction within the depths of our spirit and which are not felt and mediated *through the senses* or *by things we possess* but by those thoughts and feelings which transcend this material external world wherein we seem to live and move and have our whole being. I have in mind those deeply rooted thoughts and emotions which cannot be counted or measured or weighed by any material units of description or computation—such as the illimitable mass of our affections within our own family groups or the circle of our friends, or in that still larger sphere which commands our interests and solicitude for the welfare of humanity in general; or our instinctive appreciation of the order and beauty of the world in which we live, our sense of justice and fair play, of duty, honor, the dictates of conscience, and the integrity of character. "These are the things that men live by." It is only through an idealism of such a nature that we can penetrate to the core of reality. Otherwise we live on the surface of existence and never sound its profound depths.

What is needed today, in order to face the present war and to prepare for the peace when it comes, is the reaffirmation not only in thought but in practice of the fact that there is a fundamental distinction between right and wrong. Moreover, there must be a recognition especially that the extreme individualism of business methods and practices must give way to a quickening sense of the common lot of man, and that prosperity which appears in spots cannot survive the incompleteness of the whole. When "Big Business" thrives at the expense and failure of smaller and competing enterprises, when wealth accumulates and poverty grows apace, when industry flourishes and agriculture decays, when one section of the country enjoys abnormal prosperity and another an equally abnormal depression, then there can be no question of common weal. We have been shortsighted in failing to understand that the welfare of the whole can be maintained only when the prosperity of all parts and phases of our nation is not allowed to become impaired. We are slowly learning the lesson that America's prosperity cannot indefinitely continue so long as there is an impoverished Europe, Asia, and Africa. So, also within our country itself we must seek that kind of prosperity in which every part of our land, every social stratum, capitalist and laborer, big business and small, the corner

grocer and the chain store, can all benefit together. The common weal is democracy's objective.

It is very easy to recognize the fact that we are all one, bound together by common interests in times of common peril, in such crises as this global war or the depression that existed before the war. But when peace and prosperity appear, there comes in their wake that absorption in self-centered interest that makes cooperative effort nigh impossible. In these years of this global war, it is the menace of a common peril that gives unity of spirit to our people and the sense of comradeship. The peril now confronting us is that there exists an indifference as to further sacrifices and a desire to relax our efforts in laying the foundations for a permanent peace and thus be left morally and spiritually bankrupt as well as financially insolvent after the war is over. That will again mean the winning of the war and the loss of the peace. For we must constantly bear in mind that the noble freedoms and the democratic ideal we inherited from the founders of our nation must be earned and won before we can call them our own and, furthermore, that none of the freedoms incorporated in our Constitution and our Bill of Rights is fully achieved; that in a democracy they are constantly in the process of achievement, that it takes great effort to hold and consolidate the gains we have already made, and still more heroic effort to extend the confines of these rights.

Religious geniuses—the prophets, Jesus, St. Francis, Gandhi—all of them seem to agree in their teaching on a basic assumption. The assumption is that of the supreme worth of the individual. The intrinsic worth of the individual is also the basic ethical factor in our democratic form of government. Out of this fundamental postulate has come the corollary: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." For thy neighbor is thy other self. This according to Jesus—and according to history—is one of the most important and imperative teachings that ever proceeded out of the heart of man. And modern man must also draw a corollary and formulate the commandment: "Thou shalt build an economic system and a social order in which it shall be possible for people to love their neighbors as themselves." We are responsible for the world being what it is today. Any hope for building a better world rests upon the people in it—upon you and me.

A Poet's Peace*

First Prize

Give man his fertile acre
And he will let
The whole world be.

There he will build his altar,
Light his candle,
And plant his tree.

He will grow a purple plum,
A peach, a walnut—
And a vine—

That he may shake his arbor
And press his grapes
For amber wine.

Eve's head upon his pillow,
Their love's cradle
His Holy Grail;

When man has bread aplenty
He casts aside
His coat of mail!

FLORENCE THIOT MILNER.

Second Prize

Built on the rock of justice, it would be,
Sturdily fashioned with the truth as tool;
Buttressed by honor and integrity,
Its timbers measured by the golden rule.

This poet's House of Peace would be designed
To let the sun of understanding in;
Four-square and vast, to welcome all mankind,
To shelter nations as one race and kin.

Then, though the rains should come and floods descend,
And storm and tempest beat against its bars
Unshaken it would stand, "world without end,"—
Yes, though its towers prick the splendid stars,
It would not fall, in spite of stress and shock—
"The wise man sets his house upon a rock."

GERTRUDE LYON SYLVESTER.

Third Prize

World . . . where the late sun burns into ashes
Yokes of fear,
Where the warm seas melt
Floes of doubt.
World . . . where the stars bloom in gardens of promise,
Where the clouds move lightly
Through heavens of joy.

World . . . our new world singing:
Baskets of plenty,
There is no want . . .
Charters of freedom,
There is no fear.

World . . . our new world singing,
Forever singing:
Tally the poet's voice
Ripe with the wisdom of truth,
Tally the poet's cry
Rich in the doctrine of love.

World . . . oh new world flushed with joy,
Where men stand united . . .
Bound in a brotherhood
Of peace.

WESTON MCDANIEL.

*These poems were the winners in a contest conducted in memory of the late Dr. Ralph Cheyney for the best poems on A Poet's Peace. The judges were the late Art Young, Margaret Widdemer, Margery Mansfield, Shaemas O'Sheel, and R. Malcolm Bozarth.

Racial Democracy in the Ethical Societies

W. EDWIN COLLIER

Long before the current wave of interest in better race relations swept over so many religious denominations, racial democracy was being practiced in the Ethical Societies. This was no doubt a result of the particular philosophy of Dr. Felix Adler, the founder of the Ethical Movement.

The Societies share that common religious faith in the worth of the individual which is the ultimate basis of opposition to intolerance. Originating in prophetic Judaism and constituting the heart of the message of Jesus, this teaching was re-emphasized by the Protestant Reformation. It was gradually built into the structure of British political institutions and law, and so became part of our American heritage. The political ideal of democracy, in general, and the first ten Amendments to the Constitution, in particular, rest upon belief in the sacredness, integrity, and importance of the individual.

A further necessary step for those who would implement in practical ways their faith in the ultimate worth of the individual soul, is the realization that the goal of perfection is not the same for each. If what the Apostle said is true of the heavenly bodies—"There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory,"—no less is it true of souls. There are many types of perfection and of beauty, types which are mutually incompatible and cannot co-exist in one and the same man; as George Santayana has pointed out, "What is beautiful in a child is hideous in a man, and vice versa; every age, every country, each sex, has a peculiar beauty, finite and incommunicable; the better it is attained, the more completely it excludes every other."

This fact, which Santayana approached from an aesthetic angle, Doctor Adler proclaimed from an ethico-religious standpoint. He saw not only the supreme worth of each individual and the distinctive differences between one individual and another; he saw also their interrelatedness, and this was central to his whole system of thought. In his so-called "organic philosophy" he sought to demonstrate not only the ideal of moral perfection for each individual, not only the differences of ethos and therefore of perfection inherent in different individuals, but also the fact that the perfection of one was necessary to the perfection of another and the perfection of each to that of all. The system of interrelationships in the spiritual realm was, in his belief, such that each of us advances towards perfection only by seeking to stimulate the best in his neighbor—a best distinctively different from his own best—while the *"corpus spirituale"* or "ethical manifold" can never attain its total perfection if a single one of these individual perfections is lacking. To such a system, all intolerance is intolerable and those who accept it are constrained not to oppose or suppress those who are different from themselves but to do all in their power to further their neighbor's moral development as being necessary to their own perfection and to that of the universe.

Doctor Adler's personal philosophy has never been binding upon the Ethical Movement which has no dogmatic creed or metaphysical orthodoxy, but there has been a general acceptance amongst its members of the practical rule of life which Adler deduced from the principles above outlined. This rule he formulated in the words, "So act as to elicit the best in others and you will thereby release the best that is in yourself"; "so act as to assist in bringing to light the unique excellence in others and you will thereby bring to light the unique excellence that is in yourself." This is the maxim which governs the attitude of members of the Ethical Societies towards those of other races, other nations, and other faiths.

Probably the most sensational contribution towards racial democracy made by the Ethical Societies was the calling together of the first Universal Races Congress. This Congress was arranged, with the cooperation of many of the world's most important governments, by the International Ethical Union, and met at the University of London, England, in July 1911. The general committee included representatives of thirty-five countries, and the published volume of transactions includes papers contributed by scholars and administrators from Austria, Belgium, Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Germany, all parts of Great Britain and the British colonies, Haiti, Holland, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Persia, Poland, Russia, Turkey, and the United States. The outbreak of World War I in 1914 and subsequent world conditions have prevented any effective follow-up of this magnificent beginning.

The Ethical Societies have always believed in inspiring their members to work for social advances through organizations created to effect reforms in specific areas of human relationships rather than in duplicating the efforts of such institutions by trying to accomplish the same purposes by independent action. Hence much of the best work for racial democracy undertaken by members of Ethical Societies has been performed under the aegis of other bodies. For example, Dr. Horace J. Bridges, Leader of the Chicago Ethical Society, was a foundation member and one of the original Board of Directors of the Chicago Urban League (1916). He became its second President in 1919. Its first Treasurer was Mr. A. Kenyon Maynard, a teacher in the Chicago Ethical Society's Sunday School, while its present Treasurer is Mr. B. J. Cahn, Vice-President of the Chicago Ethical Society. Mr. Hutton Hynd, Leader of the St. Louis Ethical Society, is a member of the Board of Directors and of the Executive Board of the Urban League in that city, and is Chairman of its Industrial Committee. Mr. Henry Putzel, President of the Society, and Mrs. W. Langsdorf, wife of the former President, are also Board members of the League. In addition, Mr. Henry Putzel, President, and Mr. Walston Chubb, Secretary, of the St. Louis Society, have been appointed on the Mayor's Interracial Committee. Mr. Algernon D. Black of the New York Society for Ethical Culture is Co-Chairman of the Citywide Citizens Committee on Harlem. Robert D. Kohn, President of the American Ethical Union, is a member of the Board of Directors of the Common Council for American Unity. Dr. Henry Neumann, Leader of the Brooklyn Society, was one of a committee of six appointed by the United States Government to look into conditions at the Relocation Camps for West Coast Japanese. Mrs. Leon T. Stern, wife of the President of the Philadelphia

Ethical Society, is a Board member of the Armstrong Association, and Mr. Max Shubin, one of the members, is a Director of Fellowship House. An indefinite number of similar instances could be given, involving both the Leaders and the lay members of the Ethical Movement.

Within the Societies themselves, racial democracy has been taken so much for granted for fifty years that the details scarcely seem matters for special mention. We in the Movement cannot get excited, in the current fashion, because a Jew—or a non-Jew—addresses our Sunday Meeting; it does not occur to us as an event worthy of publicizing, that we have sat down at the same table with a Negro. Interracial democracy in the Ethical Societies, the specific subject on which this article was requested, has, from the members' point of view, long ceased to be remarkable. The original pioneer band of Leaders and founders of Societies consisted of one Jew and four Gentiles, and this admixture has persisted ever since. At the present time the Leadership is approximately two-thirds of Gentile, and one-third of Jewish background. Within the last two years the Philadelphia Ethical Society has had as members of its professional staff a Leader, English-Gentile; an Associate Leader, Austrian-Gentile (refugee); a staff-worker, German-Jewish (refugee); an organist, American-Jewish; and a deputy organist, American Negro. Board members and group leaders include whites and Negroes, Gentiles and persons of Jewish origin, native born Americans and foreign born. The general membership of the Movement is of the same mixed type, Gentiles predominating in some centers and not in others. This variation in numerical preponderance varies with local conditions and is regarded in the Movement as being of no particular significance.

Henry Booth Settlement House, founded and maintained by the Ethical Society in Chicago, has both whites and Negroes on its staff. The staff of the Ethical Society's Southwark Neighborhood House includes Gentile, Jewish, white, and colored persons. Colored children are accepted in the Movement's Sunday Schools and Day Schools, Paul Robeson being one of our Fieldston Ethical Culture School parents. The Women's Club of the Chicago Society has furthered the work of the Urban League; the Public Affairs Committee of the New York Society is concentrating on minority problems. Refugee Service Committees in all the Societies on the Eastern seaboard have provided help, in the form of affidavits, passage money, personal counsel and friendship, religious services, job placement, English and citizenship classes, and so forth, for those driven from Europe by the Nazi-Fascist tyranny, without regard to their racial origin or religious tenets. Even Hitler, when he had effected the Anschluss with Austria, gave a perverted recognition to the racial democracy of the Vienna Ethical Society by jailing the Gentile Leader and his Jewish colleague without distinction! A mixed (white and Negro) dance for members of a Negro army unit stationed near the Meeting House, was conducted by the young people of the New York Society; the young people of the Philadelphia Society have entertained relocated Japanese, and the Y.P.A. of the Brooklyn Society has arranged exchange visits with Negro church groups: annually for thirty-two years, on Easter Sunday, its Sunday School children have been taking plants and a program to an old folks home for colored citizens.

We are, needless to say, unfeignedly glad to see a more liberal attitude being at length adopted by a considerable number of churches in other denominations. Nor are we complacent and satisfied with regard to our own efforts. But having had the privilege of serving for more than a decade a fellowship with the kind of record here briefly sketched, the writer, for one, cannot feel much sympathy with the hullabaloo of strident self-congratulation which is emanating today from religious organizations which had never welcomed Jew or Negro across their thresholds so recently as five years ago. Talking racial democracy is one thing; making an occasional publicity-catching gesture towards it is another, not very different—and quietly living it for half a century is something else again!

Camp Smokemont

BERNARD GEORGE WEINBERG

It is afternoon along the majestic highway that climbs to the famous Clingman's Dome in North Carolina. Some say that this is the highest highway in the East. I walk along with an axe over my shoulder, seeking those great forest giants who, having died, implore burial from man—lest their great trunks become a threat to the forest and to the life which inhabits it.

It is a hot afternoon. For all the altitude there is no movement of the wind. The Southern sun smites the ground and radiates to a height quite unusual. Through the air, shimmering in the heat, is visible a man seated deep within the wood, resting on one of those giant chestnuts whose whole tribe is fast becoming extinct—perhaps like the Cherokee Indian who also dwells in the Great Smokies. Surprised at the appearance of another person in the forest, I cut in among the trees and approach the stranger who betrays no surprise upon seeing me.

Nothing seems to have been said between us for a long time. The quiet of the road has become the hush of the woods. Then he speaks—this odd stranger—and this is the burden of his speech, "It is sad to think that though Nature can be so harmonious man must be so violent and contentious." Dreamily, and I would dare say compassionately, he gazes at me and says, "Do you think that men will ever learn to abandon their differences, their varying beliefs, their use of force long enough to travel in the direction of Peace?" Taken aback by the directness of the stranger's speech and by the challenge in the tone of his voice I stand gazing at his half-smiling face. I do not find it easy to reply. I shift my gaze a bit. . . .

Looming three thousand feet below this peak, Clingman's Dome, is our small Smokemont camp. I speak to the man and say: I do not know how to answer you. I find your words very challenging. It is sad to contemplate the anguish and violent force which rages throughout the world. But I would like at the same

time to point to that little camp of twenty-five young men which rests a half-mile below us. Living there together are many of widely divergent beliefs and creeds. You can find in that community Baptists, Quakers, Methodists, Church of Christ-ers, and more—an Oriental, and a Hebrew. The varied stretches and populations of our country are all represented. The French-Canadians are represented as well as the Chinese. And I say unto you that *there* all force has been abrogated in favor of harmony. There, no man has or ever would strike his brother. The atmosphere of tolerant good humor that dominates the group inspires me to believe that whatever may be their individual shortcomings, they have a basis upon which they can live peacefully—and they are so living.

The stranger looks understandingly at me. He rises from his place. "You have cheered me much," he says, "I had forgotten myself for a moment. We must be of good cheer—for if God but lend His strength to us we may yet 'overcome the world'."

Jesus and Religion

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

In quarters where the general findings of recent New Testament criticism are accepted, certain problems arise when efforts are made to formulate religious ideas into specifically Christian terms. Historically, religion has provided the standard of assessment and discrimination which has been regarded as personified under the figure of Jesus Christ; the justification for this identification has been found in the traditional creeds of Christendom with the claims to Divine Sonship which they make. Outside the narrowest ecclesiasticism, the creeds are no longer accepted as statements of fact; their philosophical justification has withered and their authority is gone; they have become dead stereotypes in Lippmann's sense of the term. The exact claims made by the New Testament for Jesus Christ may be referred to Jewish legend or to the Gentile Mystery Cults. It is worse than useless to seek some method of minimizing accommodation; the traditionally orthodox position has either to be accepted or rejected and the days of varying measures of accommodation perished with the older liberal Protestantism and its many anachronistic fallacies. There are many historical difficulties when the figure of Jesus comes to be assessed. As Professor Burkitt has shown, only a few days are recorded in the Gospels out of a lifetime; the number of sayings reputed to have been uttered by Jesus of Nazareth which have been preserved is but a handful; H. J. Cadbury illustrated the danger of modernizing Jesus. Certain negative issues must arise when the question is surveyed concerning the extent to which these historico-critical questions have affected formulations of religion.

The first warning to arise is against an excessive hero-making in religion. It was uttered many years ago by Francis Newman, the Unitarian brother of the Cardinal, and is in constant need of repetition. An assumption has been made too readily that the figure of Jesus is the only, or at least the main, door to an understanding of religious mysticism. For example, the Quaker scholar, J. W. Rowntree, accused Unitarians of being too cold and abstract; religious feeling and apprehension must be personified to attain point. But, what if recent historical criticism, such as that of Guignebert or Loisy, will not sustain the personification which the centuries of tradition have made? The great danger of religious hero-worship, as Francis Newman saw, is that it tends to identify the ultimate truth of religion with a questionable interpretation of certain events within history; at a time of challenge, the inner religion will be in danger of disappearing with the interpretation which scientific criticism has disproved. This point is in constant need of repetition, for some religious liberals have been as persistent in their hero-making as have the orthodox. Viewing the history of religions as a pattern, as does Salomon Reinarch in *Orpheus*, Jesus of Nazareth takes a natural and an honored place. But it is not a place identified with that of the hero, whether it be the Divine Hero from ancient times known to the anthropologist, or the "hero" in the vaguer ethical sense which the term bears in modern English culture. Religion has a far wider meaning; there is a relationship between the great faiths of the world; contemporary cultural levels call for their own integrations and it is more than doubtful whether they will be in terms of personifications any longer.

A second warning centers in a danger of popular assumption. Jesus is recorded to have uttered various sayings and to have given certain injunctions. They are quoted frequently as of binding authority for all time, an attitude which was shown by the use of certain sayings reputed to Jesus by ecclesiastics who gave evidence before the Royal Commission on Divorce Law Reform. In Roman Catholic theology, the excuse would be made that they are sustained by the tradition of the church, an argument which many authors, such as Doctor Cadoux, Doctor Coulton or Joseph McCabe have effectively answered. But, in Protestant thought, this argument is lacking and the authoritarian is forced back on to an excessive literalism. Yet there are several severe dangers inherent in this point of view. The words of Jesus are preserved through the medium of early Christian preaching—the background of the Gospel tradition. Their original context is not preserved nor is it possible to consult the whole of the utterances made by Jesus, for the bulk of them have obviously perished. Hence, any saying of Jesus which is quoted concerning God, man, or religion, must, in the nature of things, be to some degree a quotation made out of the original context. Its value is minimized very severely if the traditional doctrine of the Deity of Christ be rejected—a point which serves to recall that Christian orthodoxy has always been something other than a religious hero-worship. Again, there is no evidence of any kind that, were he to live over again, Jesus would now say the words which he said then. His acceptance of Jewish apocalyptic and his belief in the nearness of the end mark him out as a man of his country and age; these mythologies have given shape and color to his teaching. But evidence is wholly wanting that, if he were living today, he would say once again to his followers: "Thou shalt not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come," or that he would identify himself with Messianic claims to authority. The point is highly im-

portant; the words of Jesus are frequently used to justify a Gandhi-like pacifism as binding upon all Christians; they could also be used in a very literal sense to attack all riches and to ennoble material poverty. There are historical and cultural reasons why Jesus took up this standpoint within the society of his land and generation. Yet there is absolutely no final reason at all for supposing that, could he live again amid the highly complex circumstances of a modern industrial society differing so vastly from his own environment, he would adopt these theological or social views once more and repeat the self-same words. The point is one which preachers might remember as an antidote to the all-too-common habit of sealing their argument with a text which claims to give the words of Jesus on whatever subject is in hand!

The approach to Jesus of Nazareth has become negative in large measure owing to the amount of past legacies which have to be swept from the road and the extent to which they hamper clear thinking upon the subject. But one general affirmation does stand out. Jesus can no longer be claimed as Son of God in the credal meaning of the phrase, as a "Redeemer" and "Divine Hero" in the sense which the Mystery Religions would have laid upon the term, nor as a "moral hero" in the unhistorical form given to him by certain liberalized Protestant theologies which would seek to relate his teaching in terms of recent ethical culture. Yet he stands forth as one of many doors to an understanding of the Divine Mystery underlying all existence, for he occupies a sure niche in the general pattern of world religion. If God has intended man to reach the stars, however, it is becoming increasingly clear that he must get there himself by his own unaided efforts and not through the mediation of any one hero of traditional religion. Jesus of Nazareth represents an attitude to existence which is transcendental; it is not linked up with his exact words or the hero-worship which men may, or may not, give to his person; it is, in fact, a far greater affirmation than any of these things. Man, striving upwards, may learn from this attitude and yet he has to save himself by his own strivings; having looked back across the centuries at Jesus, he must turn away to struggle forward once again. The qualities of moral valuation accepted by the historic figure are transcendental; they break through the imperfect narrative; his words and sayings are limited by his own day and generation. The Christian Church as a whole has erred by tending to set aside the qualities as a guide to practical living whilst adopting a literalism which has bound it up with the more uncertain elements present in the general question!

Voices of Latin America*

V. Gilberto Freyre: Brazilian Sociologist

JOHN H. HERSHEY

Gilberto Freyre, a leading social scientist of Brazil, not only tolerates but advocates the mixture of diverse races. He is professor of social anthropology at the Normal School of Pernambuco. This city, also called Recife, is the capital of the State of Pernambuco, located on the much-discussed "bulge" of Brazil. He was born in the same city, on March 15, 1900, and is of Portuguese and Spanish extraction, having descended from an old Brazilian family. For ten years he attended an American Baptist school in his native land. Lewis Hanke writes in the *Revista Hispánica Moderna* (April, 1939), about Freyre's experience in the school, as follows:

> Here he passed through a grave religious crisis produced by the evangelical environment in which he lived. Afterward he lost interest in Protestantism and felt that it was opposed to the deepest intellectual and spiritual tendencies of his temperament.

His further education was obtained in universities of the United States, including Columbia where he studied under the late anthropologist, Franz Boas. Later as a professor he taught in several universities in the United States. Travel has also taken the Brazilian beyond the American continent to England, France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, and Portugal. In 1935 he established a department of sociology and anthropology in the University of the Federal District in Rio de Janeiro; the department, however, was finally abolished by conservatives. Freyre has a number of books to his credit, and also articles of which some have been published in American periodicals. Referring to his books on Brazilian dwellings, the Argentine sociologist, Alfredo Poviña, says, "Freyre endeavors to comprehend the collective life by means of 'habitats,' holding that the genus of the life of men is in the function of the architecture of the house."

Let us consider in turn Professor Freyre's attitudes toward race, democracy, and Pan-Americanism. Brazil has a population composed of a diversity of races—whites, Negroes, Indians, and various mixtures. The number of Indians in proportion to the population is small compared to such countries as Bolivia and Ecuador. As to the Negroes, Freyre does not accept the idea that they are biologically inferior, physically or otherwise. Laziness, sexual depravity, and other similar characteristics attributed to Negroes because of race are, when they exist, due to past conditions of slavery. Furthermore, they have actually made contributions to the development of Brazil "from culinary art to metallurgy of iron." Those of Indian and Negro blood are called in Portuguese, "cafuse." Millions have varying degrees of white and Negro blood. These are mulattoes, quadroons, octoroons. Charles A. Gauld who has made a special study of the racial composition of Brazilians, writes in *Brazil* (October, 1941):

> In Brazil the most numerous group is the mulattoes and persons of three-way mixture. . . . Brazil, unlike Mexico, Central America, and the Andean nations, is definitely not an Indian-and-mestizo nation. Racially it more closely resembles the Caribbean Islands, where Negro blood has for centuries been prominent or predominant.

And Waldo Frank writes: "Vast Brazil, for example, gave birth to an Afro-Creole race which is neither African nor Portuguese." Sharp differences exist as to whether the fusion of such diverse blood is good biologically. Even apart from the question of the inferiority or superiority of races, some think that such mixture is bad. Gilberto Freyre, however, believes that such mixtures are not bad but good, and that the world is better rather than worse because of the fusion.

*The fifth of a series of articles on Latin-American leaders appearing from time to time in the columns of UNITY.

With reference to the meaning of democracy, the Brazilian professor holds that social and racial democracy is more fundamental than mere political forms. In a long and interesting interview with Jack Harding, as reported in the latter's book, *I Like Brazil,* Freyre remarked, in speaking of the United States:

> What you loosely call democracy is in fact a representative system that makes no sincere move toward the social democracy we love here. You don't tolerate blacks in your restaurants or even in your fashionable churches. In Brazil they go where they like; admitting them is not even a gesture, but a perfectly unconscious procedure. That is the result of the fusion of bloods.

Democracy thus means for Freyre primarily that "persons of worth have equal opportunity to reach higher levels regardless of their social or racial origins." Brazil, he maintains, has this kind of democracy. He thus makes a distinction between the ideal of democracy and its particular forms. The former is more important than the latter. There is no good reason for attempting to have each American nation adopt an identical form of government. Here it may be noted that the original Constitution of Brazil was patterned, in many respects, upon the Constitution of the United States; but a new Constitution was adopted in 1934 under President Getulio Vargas, leader of the so-called "New State." Even a constitutional monarchy, Freyre thinks, could be consistent with democratic feeling and sentiment. He himself is sympathetic toward the idea that representation in central government be based on regions and on economic activities. As for the regime of President Vargas, Freyre is certain that it will not foster race prejudice. The social equality of races in his country, he says, "is probably the most democratic, the most Christian, and the most American, in the continental sense, way of dealing with the problem."

Gilberto Freyre has also expressed himself regarding Pan-Americanism. No American government should seek to impose its particular form on any other country. There needs to be continental action for protecting and defending the Western Hemisphere. The sentiment for democracy can be one of the principles making for continental solidarity. Closer relations in various ways between all the American countries need to be realized. The keynote of inter-American relations, the Brazilian sociologist says, should be reciprocity.

The Study Table

Simple Human Drama

A Tree Grows in Brooklyn. *By Betty Smith. New York: Harper & Bros. 443 pp. $2.75.*

If you know nothing about Brooklyn, you should read Betty Smith's first novel and get acquainted; if you *do* know Brooklyn, you should let this same novel bring you closer to the heart of one of the most American of America's cities. It is about simple folks in that section of Brooklyn known as Williamsburg that this story is written. Since the folks here pictured—second-generation scions of Irish and Austrian immigrants—are so utterly human, so convincingly real, so pathetic, and withal so superbly alive with hope and faith, and since the author has managed to pack her story with so much simple human drama, and to let her characters speak with such convincing truthfulness and charming frankness, you will have a real literary experience associating with your introduction to Brooklyn or with your revival of an old friendship for this "borough of churches," the famous home of the notorious Dodgers, affectionately known to all Brooklynites as "dem Bums."

The story deals chiefly with the Nolan family, a typical American household of working folks, struggling to make ends meet, and finally, through a stroke of good fortune plus the application of grit and dogged perseverance, coming out on top. There is tragedy and drama galore in these pages; not of the vivid, high color variety, indeed, but of that human quality that makes the reader feel "there but for the grace of God. . . ." Miss Smith has a knack for weaving a plot and drawing character and personality, and she possesses that elusive artistic "something" that is a *sine qua non* of good writing, and there is good writing in *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn.*

You will like the people who walk through these pages: Johnny Nolan, a dapper, handsome, sweet singer of sweet Irish songs, and as irresponsible at work and drink as he is irresistible in love and song. He works as a singing waiter, rarely ever makes enough to keep the family in food and clothing, and dies of exposure and alcoholism after a fit of despondency and futility had driven him from home on a cold winter night. Katie, his hard-working wife, is a child of the Austrian immigrants, the Rommelys. She has one ambition, to spare her three children the agony of poverty and insecurity that has haunted her and Johnny, and too early threatens to turn her from a gay and carefree beauty into a worn slattern and drab drudge. And there is Francie, the real heroine of the story; she has a gift for storytelling, a vivid imagination, and a fine sense of personal integrity. One of the classical passages in the book is the scene between her and her English teacher, Miss Garnder; Francie has submitted several short stories to her teacher, stories dealing with her own experiences of poverty and want. Miss Garnder, sternly aloof from all realism and "truth in literature," chides her for seeking "beauty" in drabness and ugliness, with the result that our blossoming author early decides that English teachers may, after all, be the least qualified as judges of real literature. Neeley, the only boy of the Nolans, has much of his father's personality, but much more genuine character, and the end of the story that sees Francie on her way to college and a literary career sees Neeley launched on the road to a professional calling. The other member of the Nolan clan is little Annie Laurie, born shortly after her father's death, the darling of the family.

The turn for the better in the fortunes of the Nolans comes several years after Johnny's death, when the former police captain and now the precinct-leader Michael McShane offers the widowed Katie his hand in marriage. This assures the future of the family, provides Katie with the long-deserved comfort and security and makes certain that her children shall not have to suffer what she and Johnny had so amply endured.

One of the most delightful characters in the book is that of Mary Rommely, mother of Katie. This simple Austrian immigrant can neither read nor write, but

she has a fierce love for learning, has a remarkable memory for folklore and fairy tale, and nurtures a passionate devotion to the ideals of education and security. She is described as an illiterate person but a saintly soul, and Miss Smith's capacity for apt and brief characterization is nowhere better illustrated than in these simple lines that describe Mary Rommely, "she understood why people had to lie and steal and harm one another. She knew of all pitiful human weaknesses and of many cruel strengths." It is the old grandmother Rommely who delivers herself of such bits of homely wisdom and folk-philosophy as "in the old country, a man is given to the past. Here he belongs to the future," or when she advises her children "to look at everything always as though you were seeing it either for the first or last time: thus is your time on earth filled with glory."

Here is another bit of that flair for quick and convincing characterization in contrasting the characters of the two older Nolans:

> Katie had a fierce desire for survival which made her a fighter. Johnny had a hankering after immortality, which made him a useless dreamer. And that was the great difference between these two who loved each other so well.

It was from Grandma Rommely that Katie took the suggestion that every day the Nolans should read at least a few paragraphs from the two "greatest books in the world," Shakespeare and the Bible; for Grandma has made up her mind that there is a two-fold way to happiness, education and the possession of a home. Which reminds one of Bonaro Overstreet's sentence regarding the American dream: "The American dream is a dream with home at the end."

Whatever else a reading of *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn* may do for you, it is bound to introduce you to a coming figure in American literature, it is certain to give you an artistic picture of Brooklyn's Williamsburg section at the beginning of this century, and it is without question going to make you love America more. And that is saying a lot for any novel.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

From the Holy Roman Empire to Masaryk

CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN EUROPEAN HISTORY. *By S. Harrison Thomson. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press. 390 pp. $3.75.*

This important history of Czechoslovakia ought to be read by every person interested in the future of Europe, for the peace of Europe depends on the future of the Czechs. Neither can the Czech question nor the European question be settled in ignorance of historical origins. The Czechs are the most westernized and modernized of Slavic peoples. The value of this history lies in the fact that the author considers the Czechs and their land not in isolation, but as participants in the whole European picture. The result is a long range view of the problems of a small state which were so badly handled after the first World War. Just now the Czechs are undergoing a crucial testing, but the testing applies also to their kinsmen the Slovaks and to the Germans of the Sudetenland. But the Czechs will survive. "They have bowed under many catastrophes, and unless history means nothing at all, they are likely to survive this latest hour of adversity." This book ought to be required reading for all those who are planning the post-war world. The Czechs before suffered much from the hands of men ignorant of history; let us hope this will not be repeated. It will not be repeated if this volume is used by those responsible for the new Europe.

C. A HAWLEY

Correspondence

Many Mansions

To UNITY:

When the editor of *Books Abroad,* with a journalist's sense for the sensational, sent out his query for "the world's most overpraised book" he was favored with a few answers that might well have made him pause. Mary Lamberton Becker refused the request because any selection she might make would only be an indication of her "own prejudices, preferences, and experience or lack of it." Lewis Mumford urged the editor "to cultivate a little decent humility." But a goodly number rushed in where wiser critics feared to tread. With the flippancy of a perennial youngster one contributor lists as fit for this honor 90 per cent of Shakespeare and Goethe, 97 per cent of Shelley, and 95 per cent of Keats. Is it any wonder that others list *Don Quixote* and *The Divine Comedy?* Doctor Holmes, in the January issue of UNITY, is astounded at this and then expresses his delight at seeing *Moby Dick* conspicuous on the list. He applauds the inclusion of Goethe's *Werther* and of Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain.* But why do these books continue to appeal to thoughtful readers? Is any individual's judgment infallible? Doctor Holmes also applauds the inclusion of the second part of Goethe's Faust, aptly called "Goethe's wastebasket." But why did Goethe put it above the first part that Doctor Holmes rightly hails as a towering achievement? And why do most Goethe scholars agree with Goethe and devote years of their life to its study, as others study Plato, and find ample reward in the labor? "In my father's house are many mansions" applies especially to the field of art where one man's nightingale may be another man's crow. But do we have to stone the nightingale? It is quite possible that the reader's own shortcomings bar his road. Every important work of literature makes its special demands on the reader. He must be prepared for it, and not only intellectually. And above all must put himself into a receptive mood and surrender himself to the poet and his work. Blessed are the humble in spirit, for they may find a little wisdom!

Madison, Wisconsin. FRIEDRICH BRUNS.

Reply to Doctor Holmes

To UNITY:

Doctor Holmes in his frequent defense of the Roman Hierarchy can overlook many things. However, he cannot deny the existence of the evil partnership between Franco and the Vatican that murdered the Spanish Republic. He cannot deny the existence of a plan in the mind of the Pope to set up Catholic states in Italy and France. Will he try to deny the efforts of the Vatican to destroy democratic government, including Protestant churches in South America?

Of course there are many fine people, including priests, in the Roman Church but the controlling power is so obviously a religio-political Fascism that real religious liberals feel it a duty to expose this force. The Vatican could be a great force for good in the world but since the destruction of the Spanish Republic through the alliance of German technicians, Italian troops, and the Roman Church plotting, most of us have given up hope of the leopard changing its spots.

Mt. Vernon, New York. JAMES W. MCKNIGHT.

Political Prisoners in India

To UNITY:

According to a recent dispatch in the *New York Times*. Mr. Leopold S. Amery, Secretary for India, admitted in the House of Commons that more than 7,500 leaders of Indian Nationalists are "detained" in various parts of India without any trial. The only crime of these Nationalists is that they want their country to have a National Government of their own and thus be able to have due share in matters of defense, foreign relations, and financial control of their country; and that they oppose the present British dictatorship in India—racial, economic, and political Imperialism.

This war is for World Freedom, we are told; and we believe in a single standard of justice and freedom for all peoples—European, Asiatic, or African; white, brown, or black—because they are all God's children.

We plead for the immediate release of Indian political leaders—Gandhi, Nehru, Azad—and thousands who are kept in jail. We suggest, as Mr. Henry Noel Brailsford in his most admirable work, *Subject India*, has proposed, that the present Indo-British conflict should be solved through mediation by leaders of the United Nations. We notice that Secretary Hull has taken the initiative for the settlement of the Russo-Polish disputes through mediation. Why does he not take the same stand on the Indian issue, when India's contribution to winning victory is only next to that of the United States, Britain, and Russia? Indians tell us the reason is that the Indian people are Asiatics and are of brown color, while the Poles are Europeans and white. Furthermore, they also suggest that tyranny by British Imperialism is sacred to the American sense of justice, while tyranny by others is intolerable—although Indians are fighting the same battle which the founders of the American Republic fought. Lastly, Polish votes in the United States amount to nearly a million and a half, which cannot be ignored; but Indians in the United States number less than five thousand and they have no vote and are excluded as immigrants. But we believe in freedom and justice for all, and thus plead for the release of Indian political prisoners and for Indian freedom—freedom for nearly 400,000,000 people from an alien rule against which the people are in revolt.

New York, N. Y. TARAKNATH DAS.

Danger of Distraction

To UNITY:

At this crisis in international, as well as national, affairs, I want to warn my fellow-Americans of the danger there is in distracting our national attention from the greater matter—greater than any political question—that of winning the war, now moving toward the establishment of the rights of men the world over.

In no other country than our own is there any thought of dismissing a Captain, and so imperiling the great cause for which millions of men under great leaders are ready to give all. This cause demands most of our treasure and all our energies. Let no candidate for the all-important post of President of these United States allow any interest—personal or otherwise—to lead him into unwise, self-seeking or party-seeking acts that would tend to break up and scatter disastrously the fine spiritual drive and the coördination that now exist between most of the production groups in their zeal to supply those we love with all they need to carry on and for self-preservation. *Now* is the time for all of us to band together for a push over the Great Divide between our armies and Hitler's lair; else it will take another war and years of greater suffering, more sorrow, and greater toil before the next great push could be undertaken.

If the loss of your son, brother, or husband; the horrible suffering of dying millions who have been, are, and will be done to death by starvation or atrocities unspeakable; if these mean anything to you, take a stand now for *no presidential change* until the great cause is victorious and the voyage is safely over.

Jamaica Plain, Mass. MRS. SIDNEY A. SHERMAN.

THE HUMANIST

$1.00 a Year
The Copy, 25c

A Quarterly

Edwin H. Wilson, Editor

IN THE SPRING ISSUE

"Thirteen Arrows Against Liberal Education" ..... Sidney Hook
"The Need for a Humanist World" ..... Ernest Caldecott
"When Humanism Becomes a Religion" ..... Harold Marley
"The Theology That Obstructs Progress" ..... Horace S. Fries
"The Passing of F. S. Marvin" ..... Henry Tompkins
"Racial Democracy" ..... Edith Hansen and C. C. Berkly
Book Reviews ..... Editor's Notes ..... A Drawing by Rockwell Kent

FREE—With new subscriptions: (a) Surprise Packet of literature, reprints, etc. (b) Two 1943 copies of THE HUMANIST. (c) 64-page pamphlet by M. C. Otto, "Scientific Humanism." State your choice of one.

The American Humanist Association, 1201 Union Street, Schenectady 8, N. Y.